б

4

8

13 14

15

1617

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

2526

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

In the Matter of the Money Transmitter License of:

No. 16F-BD067-SBD

CONSENT ORDER

CHIME, INC.

239 E. 5TH Street, 4B New York, New York 10003

Respondent.

On February 29, 2016, the Arizona Department of Financial Institutions ("Department") issued an Order to Cease and Desist; Notice of Opportunity For Hearing; Consent to Entry of Order, alleging that Chime, Inc. had violated Arizona law. Upon learning it was not properly designated as a money transmitter "authorized delegate," and with no intent to violate Arizona's statutes, Chime, Inc. promptly self-reported itself to the Department, ceased all money transmitter activities in Arizona, and fully cooperated with the Department's investigation into this matter. In the spirit of cooperation, Chime, Inc. wishes to resolve this matter in lieu of an administrative hearing, and it consents to the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and consents to the entry of the following Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. Chime, Inc. ("Respondent Company") is a Delaware corporation registered as a foreign corporation with the Arizona Corporation Commission, since August 25, 2014, License No. F19482326. Respondent Company has never been licensed with the Department.
- 2. Drew Durbin ("Mr. Durbin") is the Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") of Respondent Company, whose business is that of a money transmitter within the meaning of A.R.S. § 6-1201(11). Respondent Company was not and has not, at any time material herein, authorized to transact business in Arizona as a money transmitter within the meaning of A.R.S. § 6-1201, et seq.
- 3. Respondent Company is not exempt from licensure as a money transmitter within the meaning of A.R.S. § 6-1203.

Amount

- 4. On May 11, 2015, Respondent Company submitted a Money Transmitter license application to the Department. At the time, Respondent Company stated they were contracted as an authorized delegate of PreCash, based on representations made to Respondent Company by PreCash.
- 5. On August 10, 2015, the Department received a letter from Michael Luebbert, the Chief Compliance Officer for Respondent Company. The purpose of his letter was to apologize for misinforming the Department that his company was an authorized delegate for PreCash. As a result of Mr. Luebbert's communication, the Department requested a complete ledger history of Respondent Company's money transmitter transactions with Arizona residents.
 - 6. The transaction report from Respondent Company disclosed the following:
 - Respondent Company conducted 12,978 money transmissions totaling
 \$1,563,828.45 between November 1, 2014 and August 4, 2015.
 - ii. Respondent Company's average money transmitter transaction was \$120.50.
 - iii. Respondent Company's Balance Sheet, as of June 30, 2015, reflected liquid assets totaling \$4,394,513.40 and a total equity of \$5,088,757.41.
 - iv. Respondent Company was then licensed in twenty-three (23) states and the District of Columbia, and is now licensed in forty-four (44) states and the District of Columbia.
- 7. On August 10, 2015, the Department received an e-mailed letter from Mr. Luebbert in which he explained that on September 16, 2014, Respondent Company signed a Merchant Services Agreement with PreCash to be an authorized delegate for PreCash in all states where Respondent Company did not have a license except for Massachusetts. The PreCash Agreement specifically lists the State of Arizona as one of the states where they would be an authorized delegate. PreCash went live with Respondent Company's mobile application on October 31, 2014.
- 8. On October 5, 2015, the Department sent a written notification to Respondent Company that they were operating as an unlicensed Money Transmitter in the State of Arizona, in violation of A.R.S. § 6-1202(A) et seq.

- 9. On November 10, 2015, Mr. Luebbert responded to the Department. He stated that Respondent Company understood that PreCash paid and registered it as an authorized delegate in Arizona. On or about August 3, 2015, he contacted PreCash for a confirmation of Respondent Company's registration and was informed that the registration as an authorized delegate in Arizona had been rejected because Respondent Company did not have any physical locations in Arizona. Mr. Luebbert claims this was the first time Respondent Company was made aware that it could not conduct business in Arizona. He further stated that the 12,978 transactions processed through Respondent Company's mobile application between November 1, 2014 and August 3, 2015 were for PreCash.
- 10. Respondent Company and its representatives state that they were under the reasonable belief that they were authorized delegates under PreCash and not required to be licensed as a money transmitter in Arizona.
- 11. Respondent Company and its representatives, upon learning that they were not authorized delegates under PreCash, promptly self-reported themselves to the Department, immediately ceased all money transmitter activities in Arizona, and fully cooperated with the Department's investigation in this matter in all aspects.
- 12. Respondent Company has applied for an Arizona license as a money transmitter, which application is approved upon the Superintendent's representative executing the Order within this Consent Order.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 13. Under Title 6 of the A.R.S., the Superintendent is charged with the duty to regulate all persons engaged in the money transmitter business and with the enforcement of statutes, rules, and regulations relating to money transmitters.
 - 14. Respondent Company's conduct constitutes violation of the following:
 - i. A.R.S. § 6-1201 *et seq.* by transacting business in Arizona as a money transmitter without a license issued by the Department.

26

///

///

SO ORDERED this 5th day of July , 2016.

Robert D. Charlton
Superintendent of Financial Institutions

Tammy Seto

Division Manager

Consumer Affairs & MSBs

Department of Financial Institutions

CONSENT TO ENTRY OF ORDER

- A. Respondent Company acknowledges that it has been served with a copy of the foregoing Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order in the above-referenced matter, has read the same, is aware of the right to an administrative hearing in this matter, and has knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily waived that right.
- B. Respondent Company knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily accepts the jurisdiction of the Superintendent.
- C. Respondent Company knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily consents to the entry of the foregoing Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order.
- D. Respondent Company states that no promise of any kind or nature has been made to induce it to consent to the entry of this Order.
- E. Respondent Company agrees to immediately cease from engaging in the violative conduct set forth in the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.
- F. Respondent Company acknowledges that the acceptance of this Consent to Entry of Order by the Superintendent is solely to settle this matter and does not preclude this Department or any other agency of this state or subdivision thereof from instituting other proceedings as may be appropriate now or in the future.
- G. Failure to correct the violations set forth above in this Order or any future findings of repeated violations may result in disciplinary action that may include a greater civil money penalty.

MLuebbert5@gmail.com

26

1	Drew Durbin, CEO Chime, Inc.
2	239 E. 5th Street, 4B New York, New York 10003
3	Respondents
4	Vcorp Services, LLC 1811 Silverside Road
5	Wilmington, DE 19810-4345 Attorney for Respondent Company
6	Vcorp Services, LLC
7	300 W Clarendon Avenue, #230 Phoenix, AZ 85013
8	Statutory Agent for Respondent Company
9	De la Reside
10	5054040v.3
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	